

mo-csp

(16)

C. DE LA LEGALITE

Judicial and Pedagogical Position of
Bilingual Schools in Ontario

194-12

OTTAWA
IMPRIMERIE DU DROIT
1914

cep-3

01-CRC

1914

-12

ENGLISH-FRENCH PUBLIC AND SEPARATE SCHOOLS

CIRCULAR OF INSTRUCTIONS No. 17

1.—There are only two classes of Primary Schools in Ontario;—Public Schools and Separate Schools; but, for convenience of reference, the term English-French is applied to those schools of each class annually designated by the Minister for inspection as provided in 5 below and in which French is a language of instruction and communication as limited in 3 (1) below.

2.—The Regulations and Courses of Study prescribed for the Public Schools, which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this circular, shall hereafter be in force in the English-French schools—Public and Separate Schools with the following modifications: The provisions for religious instruction and exercises in Public Schools shall not apply to Separate Schools, and Separate School Boards may substitute the Canadian Catholic Readers for the Ontario Public School Readers.

3. Subject, in the case of each school, to the direction and approval of the Chief Inspector, the following modifications shall also be made in the course of study of the Public and Separate Schools:

THE USE OF FRENCH FOR INSTRUCTION AND COMMUNICATION

(1). In the case of French-speaking pupils, French may be used as the language of instruction and communication; but such

use of French shall not be continued beyond Form 1, excepting that on the approval of the Chief Inspector it may also be used as the language of instruction and communication in the case of pupils beyond Form 1 who are unable to speak and understand the English language.

SPECIAL COURSE IN ENGLISH FOR FRENCH-SPEAKING PUPILS

(2) In the case of French-speaking pupils who are unable to speak and understand the English language well enough for the purposes of instruction and communication, the following provisions are hereby made:

(a) As soon as the pupil enters the school he shall begin the study and the use of the English language.

(b) As soon as the pupil has acquired sufficient facility in the use of the English language he shall take up in that language the course of study as prescribed for the Public and Separate schools.

FRENCH AS A SUBJECT OF STUDY IN PUBLIC AND SEPARATE SCHOOLS

4. In schools where French has hitherto been a subject of study, the Public or the Separate School Board, as the case may be, may provide, under the following conditions, for instruction in French

Reading, Grammar, and Composition in Forms 1 to IV [see also provision for Form V in Public School Regulation 14 (5)] in addition to the subjects prescribed for the Public and Separate Schools:

(1) Such instruction in French may be taken only by pupils whose parents or guardians direct that they shall do so and may notwithstanding 3 (1) above the given in the French language.

(2) Such instruction in French shall not interfere with the adequacy of the instruction in English, and the provision for such instruction in French in the timetable of the school shall be subject to the approval and direction of the Chief Inspector and shall not in any way exceed one hour in each class-room, except where the time is increased upon the order of the Chief Inspector.

(3) Where, as permitted above French is a subject of study in a Public or a Separate School the text-books in use during the school year of 1911-1912, in French Reading, Grammar, and Composition remain authorized for use during the School year of 1913-1914.

INSPECTION OF ENGLISH-FRENCH SCHOOLS

5. For the purpose of inspection, the English-French schools shall be organized into divisions, each division being under the charge of two inspectors.

6. (1) In conducting the work of inspection the Inspectors of a division shall alternately visit each school therein, unless otherwise directed by the Chief Inspector.

(2) Each Inspector shall pay at least 220 half day visits during the year in accordance with the provisions of Public School regulation 20, (2), and it shall be the

duty of each Inspector to pay as many more visits than the minimum as the circumstances may demand.

7. Each two Inspectors of a Division shall reside at such centre or centres as may be designated by the Minister.

8. Frequently during the year the two Inspectors of a division shall meet together in order to discuss questions that may arise in their work and to standardize the system of inspection. For the same purposes all the Inspectors shall meet at such times and places as may be designated by the Minister.

9. Each Inspector shall report upon the general condition of all the classes, on the form prescribed by the Minister. This report shall be subject to the approval of the Minister upon the report of the Chief Inspector.

10. If either of the Inspector of a division finds that any Regulation or Instruction of the Department is not being properly carried out, he shall forthwith report specially on such cases to the Minister.

11. Each Inspector shall forward a copy of his ordinary inspectional report on the prescribed official form to the Minister within one week after the visit.

12. The Chief Inspector of Public and Separate Schools shall be the supervising inspector of the English-French Schools.

13. (1) No teacher shall be granted a certificate to teach in English-French schools who does not possess a knowledge of the English language sufficient to teach the Public and Separate School Course.

(2) No teacher shall remain in office or be appointed in any of said schools who does not possess a knowledge of the English lan-

guage sufficient to teach the Public and Separate School Course of Study.

LEGISLATIVE GRANTS TO ENGLISH-FRENCH SCHOOLS

14. The Legislative Grants to the English-French schools shall be made on the same conditions as are the grants to the other Public and Separate Schools.

15. On due application from the School Board and on the report of all the Inspectors, approved by the Chief Inspector, an English-French school which is unable to provide the salary necessary to secure a teacher with the aforesaid qualifications shall receive a special grant in order to assist it in doing so.

Department of Education

August 1913

SUGGESTIONS IN SETTLEMENT OF THE SCHOOL QUESTION

*Proposed to Sir James Whitney, by S. M. Genest,
Chairman of the S. S. Board, Ottawa, July, 1913*

1. There are only two classes of Primary Schools in Ontario, the Public and Separate Schools.

2. In primary Schools, both Public and Separate, the following regulations will govern the teaching to French pupils.

3. English shall be efficiently taught in all schools, in all forms and to all pupils.

4. In schools where all or nearly all pupils are of French origin, the French language will be the language of communication and instruction and besides the thorough teaching of French, English shall be efficiently taught.

5. In schools of two or more rooms, attended by pupils of both English and French extraction and besides the thorough teaching of French, English shall be efficiently taught.

5. In schools of two or more rooms, attended by pupils of both English and French extraction, the pupils shall be grouped in separate rooms, according to either of said nationalities subject always to clauses 3 and 4.

6. In schools of one room only, where pupils of English and French origin are found, the pupils of French origin shall form a separate section and this section shall be taught in English and French in accordance with 3 and 4.

INSPECTION

7. The schools, rooms and sections composed of French pupils shall be inspected by French inspectors thoroughly competent in both the English and French lan-

guage, provided always that a Roman Catholic Inspector alone be intrusted with the inspection of the Roman Catholic Schools, rooms and sections.

8. Each inspector shall pay at least 220 half day visits, during the year, in accordance with the Public School Regulation 20 (2) and it shall be the duty of each inspector to pay as many more visits than the minimum; as the circumstances may permit.

9. Each inspector shall reside at such center or centers in their inspectorates as may be designated by the Minister.

10. Each inspector shall forward a copy of his ordinary inspectional report, on the prescribed official form to the Minister and to the Secretary of the School Board within one week after the such visit.

11. At the beginning of each term, as soon as the principal or teacher of a school had made out

the time table thereof, he or she shall send a copy certified of the same to the inspector in charge of the school, school-room or section for the term, until his visit of inspection.

At the same time, the principal or teacher shall forward to the French Inspector, a statement showing the number of pupils of French origin; in attendance in such schools, rooms or sections; and to the English inspector a statement showing the number of pupils of English origin in attendance in the schools, rooms and section.

TEACHERS CERTIFICATES

12. No teacher shall be granted a certificate or be appointed to teach in aforesaid schools, rooms or sections who does not possess a knowledge of English and French sufficient to teach these language in accordance with nos. 3 and 4 of these regulation.

PREFACE

Having come into intimate contact with certain distinguished educationists who manifested much sympathy for us in our present conflict, and discussed with them the regulations promulgated by the Minister of Education of this province in connection with the English-French schools, and moreover, making use of my knowledge of law, acquired by study and practice, I have thought it incumbent upon me to give the public the conclusions drawn from these discussions and from my study of the regulations and laws touching upon this matter from the view-point of the Constitution.

In four articles published in "Le Droit", I have tried to present the question in its proper light, and I hope the reflexions inspired by the indignation I have felt over certain parts of these regulations and by the inexplicable conduct of certain of my fellow-citizens, have not obscured my summary of the situation, from which the following conclusions necessarily follow:

1. Instructions 17 change the NATURE even of the Separate Schools and virtually abolish this system of schools;

2. Instructions 17, 1 Edward VII, cap. 30, sec. 80, ss. 1 and 2, and the resolution of the Ontario Legislature adopted in 1911, upon which this regulation is founded, are unconstitutional according to caps. 92, 93 and 133 of the British North America Act;

3. Moreover, this regulations that law and the above resolution are null and void AB INITIO

since their execution is IMPOSSIBLE and contrary to natural right;

4. These various acts of the Legislature are unconstitutional because the French language is official all over Canada and, consequently in Ontario, one of the integral parts of the Dominion;

5. From an educational standpoint, the principles upon which Instructions 17 are based, are in direct opposition to the principles of pedagogy and are condemned by all the text-books on that science in use in the Normal Schools of Ontario, as well as by the Minister of Education himself in his pamphlet on the methodology of Composition recently distributed among the schools of the Province;

6. From the national and religious stand-points this regulation threatens our existence as a race, and its execution can have no other effect than to tend to separate us from the Catholic church;

7. This regulation places the French Canadians of Canada in so far as the General Course of studies is concerned and despite the pittance of time accorded to the teaching of French even after begging to obtain it, upon practically the same footing as the natives of New Zealand known as the Maoris, a people who correspond to our North American Indians.

L'Association Canadienne-Française d'Education, having decided to publish these articles in pamphlet form in order to distribute them among the friends

of our sacred cause with the object of showing them the justice of our claims, and among our enemies in order to convert them to our way of seeing and to convince them that their conduct cannot be justified, I had to take up these articles and correct them, for they had been written hurriedly and, very often, during the hours which should have been given to rest. I have even made certain slight modifications when I thought I could bring out more forcibly the point I had in view, or to expose it with more clearness and precision.

Moreover, my first intention was to discuss this question strictly from the legal view-point, but the pedagogical aspect of it introduced itself alone, as it were, in my treatment of it, and I now believe that the title under which these articles appeared, viz. : "The Juridical Position of English-French schools" no longer suffices. I have therefore added the words "and Pedagogical" to the former title, and this is why the present booklet bears its present heading.

C. de la Légalité.

Ottawa, March 26th, 1914.

JUDICIAL AND PEDAGOGICAL POSITION OF BILINGUAL SCHOOLS IN ONTARIO

FIRST ARTICLE

In order to thoroughly understand the legal standing of the English-French Separate Schools, we must refer to the British North America Act of 1867. We admit that we cannot claim the protection of this Great Charter of our rights for the English-French Public Schools, all the Public Schools being governed by the Public Schools' Act of the Province; but the "Separate" Schools, English and English-French, enjoy a special legislation which guarantees their existence as well as the integrity of their rights. Let us rather read the British North America Act itself, section 93, sub-section 1 :

"93. In and for each province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:

(1) Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the Province at the Union."

It suffices to read this text to see that, though having the power to legislate in matters of public instruction for all the schools of the Province, the Minister of Education cannot under any circumstances, exercise this power in such a way as to encroach upon the rights and privileges enjoyed by the Separate Schools at the time of Confederation.

Now, what were these rights or

privileges? By answering this question and by showing that Instructions 17 prejudicially affect them, we shall peremptorily establish the unconstitutionality of this iniquitous Regulation and, consequently, the reason for which we must not submit to it.

The Separate Schools existed previous to Confederation, and their persistence is guaranteed by the above text of the law. Now what is a Catholic Separate School: I venture to suggest the following definitions, and I believe it contains all the elements that are necessary to establish the identity of such a school.

✦ A Catholic Separate School is a collection of children of one sex, or of both sexes, confined for their instruction and education to a catholic teacher who must, in order to attain these ends (instruction and education) make use of such text books only as are truly christian and catholic; and teach in such a way that the child will constantly feel himself in the presence of God, the creator of all that he studies, and breathe an atmosphere thoroughly permeated with the catholic ideal, one in which the right to teach the catholic religion exists, said school not being hampered in its organization and its work by elements that tend to change the NATURE ITSELF of the school or to destroy its work.

Here, I believe, is the catholic school as it should exist and such as we have always had it till In-

structions 17 were promulgated, and the above-quoted text of the Constitution expressly forbids us to interfere with it.

ABOLITION OF SEPARATE SCHOOLS

The question is, do Instructions 17 clash with the divers elements contained in the above definition, elements that are essential to a Catholic Separate School? I maintain in the most unequivocal manner that it does.

By introducing in the Catholic Separate Schools the neutral books of the Public Schools it changes the NATURE ITSELF of the Separate Schools; by forcing these schools to submit to an inspection performed by a protestant inspector, these schools are hampered in their eminently christian and catholic organization. By these two means Regulation 17 under which name Instructions 17 are sometimes called, violates both the letter and the spirit of the law. Moreover, it tends to destroy the essentially catholic character of our schools, and causes the distinction that should exist between these and the Public Schools to disappear. In a word, it virtually abolishes the Separate Schools. When the books, introduced in all the Separate Schools, English and English-French, by this Regulation 17, have in a few years borne their natural and inevitable fruit, the Separate Schools will have ceased to exist in fact if not in law, and this exactly at the moment when the world is beginning to admit the correctness of the idea put into practice by their establishment and the necessity of preserving and applying the principle upon which they were founded. It suffices to read the

main editorial of "Le Droit" of the 30th ultimo, to convince oneself of this fact. The neutral school is a failure, sincere and enlightened protestants are beginning to recognize this fact and find that we are in the right when we maintain the teaching of religion in our schools. (See appendix.)

In the matter of inspection performed by protestants in our schools, it is difficult to conceive of a catholic separate school being placed under the rule and direction of a person imbued with anticatholic ideas. This direction hampers it in its organization and its work. One might as well claim that we could have, as bishops in the Catholic Church, persons who were Anglicans, Mahometans or Buddhists. A mere statement of the matter is sufficient to show to any person of good faith, the absurdity of the appointment of the protestant inspectors.

From what has just been said, it is clear that Regulation 17 violates in the most flagrant manner the first sub-section of section 93 of the British North America Act, and, consequently, is ultra vires. the Minister of Education having gone absolutely beyond his powers in framing this Regulation or Instructions.

PROTESTANT NEWSPAPERS

Now, the protestant newspapers, among others the Ottawa Citizen, "accuses" us of turning the "Bilingual School Question" into a religious question. This reproach is absolutely ridiculous, and establishes just how deeply its editors are ignorant of the law that governs this country. It proves their crass ignorance of the whole of this complex problem. One might as well accuse

a man of having observed the law as to criticize the catholics for wanting religion taught in the Catholic Separate Schools! Certainly we admit that we are "guilty" of wanting the religious element in our separate schools if it be possible to be "guilty" of exercising a legal right. Our schools are separate and, consequently, religious by right of law, and all the objections of the press of 1913 cannot change a text of the Constitution of 1867.

There is no necessity for discussing this question any further. No doubt, if the text were still a matter of debate, we would hear the dismal howlings of the Yankee preacher of the Citizen's sanctum merely at the idea that the rights of catholics could be safeguarded, which may be ascribed to his being imbued with the principles laid down in the Blue Laws of Connecticut; we would hear all the Orange clique crying out to prevent these rights from being protected by the Constitution; but it is too late now to open up a debate over the text that establishes our schools as Separate Schools and consequently religious schools. There is no power outside the Imperial Parliament that can cause them to disappear.

This point being settled, and as no one seems to object to the teaching of French for its own sake, as the Citizen says, the discussion should be closed in so far as the opponents who have hitherto faced us are concerned. They admit the teaching of French so long as it does not become a matter of religion. But religion in our schools is guaranteed by the Constitution, and no one can interfere with it. Therefore religion in the schools must remain, and French may be

taught, since no one, according to the Citizen, objects to it for its own sake. This is exactly the stand taken by the "Bilingual" school protagonists and which should receive the hearty support of the Citizen and of the other papers of similar stripe that unwittingly side with us.

Bigotry has always been productive of these contradictions, for it is essentially blind, illogical and obstinate:

"Convince a man against his will;

He's of the same opinion still."

Let us not, I pray, sacrifice the religious idea with regard to the Separate Schools, the element that forms the essence itself of these schools, for it is this feature in particular that is guaranteed by the British North America Act. Our right is clearly established by the above quoted text; let us maintain it, whatever fallacious arguments may be brought forward by our adversaries, who would like nothing better than to see us setting it aside. We have no reasons for being ashamed of it, and, by abandoning it, we cast away our most powerful weapon, the Constitution.

As for the two following questions, the limitation of the teaching of French and the imposition of a language other than the mother-tongue as the language of instruction and communication between French Canadian pupils and their teacher of the same nationality, I shall treat them in a future article. But, for the present, I may say that under these two aspects, Regulation 17 constitutes a violation of natural law and, consequently, cannot command the obedience of the supporters of English-French schools.

SECOND ARTICLE

In my first letter published here on the 3rd instant, I showed that by introducing into the Catholic Separate Schools the neutral books of the Public Schools, and by subjecting our schools to an inspection performed by protestant inspectors, Regulation 17 virtually abolished the Separate School system.

I might have added that the Minister of Education has never acted in good faith towards the Separate Schools, for, from the moment the principle of separation on religious grounds was admitted and put into practice, it became the Minister's duty to give these schools their necessary appanage of Catholic High Schools and Catholic Normal and model Schools. Was it done? No. The aim was to allow this system of schools to disappear by the gradual dying out of the faith and the cooling of Catholic zeal. Compare the Public Schools Act with that of the Separate Schools, and you will see that this one legislates only for a system of primary schools, while the former deals with a complete system of education starting from the primary classes up to the university. The Catholic authorities who were supposed to supervise the interests of catholic instruction, allowed things to go on thus and, to-day even, the only catholics with a few worthy exceptions, who are doing battle for the protection of the integral rights of Catholic Separate Schools are the French Canadians. The existence even of Catholic Separate Schools is due to the efforts of French Canadians only. The English speaking

catholics have adopted without a murmur, owing to their low cost price, all the neutral books of the neutral public schools, and, from that standpoint, the English Catholic Separate Schools are virtually abolished. Let no one ask, later on, the cause of mixed marriages; here it is, or, at least, here is one of their principal causes.

But my object to-day, after a two weeks' silence caused by the stress of professional duties is to treat of the use of the French language in the English-French, or Bilingual, Schools of this Province. And, firstly, in order to fully grasp the meaning of the problem, I shall deal with it from four distinct point of view, namely:

1. The French language as a subject of study;
2. The French language as the language of instruction;
3. The French language as the language of communication between the teacher and the pupil; and lastly
4. The rights of the French language from the legal standpoint.

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE AS A SUBJECT OF STUDY

The study of any language, be it French, English, Spanish or any other, cannot embrace, in a primary school, any other than the following subjects: reading, literature, composition, grammar and spelling.

In the more advanced courses, style, philology and the study of synonyms must be and are added to the above subjects. I shall not

here dwell upon those branches that must be taken up by the bards who aspire to soar in the ethereal regions of poetry; I shall rather limit my considerations of this matter to the primary schools, and I give the above enumeration with the intention of calling attention to the subjects that constitute the study of French. Arithmetic, for example, though explained in French, is not the study of French: it is arithmetic, whatever may be the tongue used in explaining its principles. The same argument holds for geography, history, etc.

Now, is the study of the above subjects, that is, of the French language, necessary for the French-Canadian pupils? Everyone in good faith cannot for a moment hesitate to answer in the affirmative, is he be competent to speak upon such a question, and this for several reasons, of which here are a few:

(a) From the French-Canadian standpoint. Our children must study the French language because they are French-Canadian. All other races must know it for all that that is what we are and that it is our intention to remain exactly what we are. They must know that a bad French-Canadian, and by that we mean one who abandons his language, will never be a good Canadian citizen, and certainly can never become an Englishman. No self-respecting man can ever feel anything but contempt for the mongrel who is ashamed of his mother-tongue. Following the example of Charles XII of Sweden, we say: "God gave us our French tongue and the devil himself wont take it away from us." It is true we have miniature

exars, such as Mayor Hocken of Toronto, one of the orange mamamouchis, who calls upon Irish Catholics asking them to join the fife and drum band and exert an influence upon the government in order to induce this body to deprive us of our language. Well, in answer to the Hockenses, to the Irish and to the government we say: "non potestis" (you cannot), and now, what will you do about it?

Will you put a guard in each school? If you do, he will come out, and quicker than he went in. Will you order the teachers to speak nothing but English to the pupils? In that case the latter will be instructed never to speak otherwise than in French to the teachers, because the ordinary rules of politeness exact that we should speak to a person in the latter's own tongue. Will the teacher be English-speaking? We shall not employ such a one, and no power can force us to do so. Will the teacher be a French Canadian? Yes, and he shall speak to his pupils in French whatever be the tongue of the teacher, will he have the power to punish a pupil who should speak to him in French? He will do it only once for Michel Renouf's switches will serve to set a scapegrace of this species. Must be remembered that we are not in Poland under the iron rule of the German. Fortunately, we shall never come to such a pass, despite the earnest wishes of the Hockenses "et ejusden farinae".

(b) From the Canadian standpoint. It is openly admitted that Canada would suffer an incalculable loss if the French language were to disappear from the Ame-

rican continent, such authorities as Lord Dufferin and Sir John A. Macdonald have on many occasions proclaimed this truth. 'The vivacity of our race, its intelligence, its imagination, its probity, its morality, its honesty, its tongue are French-Canadians. To what must this fact be attributed, if not to the culture obtained by the study of the French language, and to the intellectual qualities of our race. To be glorified by oneself or one's parish priest... that's so, but facts are facts and texts can be shown to clearly and irrefutably establish what I assert.

(c) From the pedagogical standpoint. From this standpoint all educators and men whose advice counts for anything, who have dwelt upon the subjects, agree in saying that the mother-tongue is the one that the teacher should use in teaching his pupils. Let us rather read what Lord Chesterfield, one of the best known authorities of the 18th century, says of this matter in the 171st letter to his son:

"...The very first principle of an orator is to speak HIS OWN language particularly, 'with the utmost purity and elegance.'"

In his 120th letter to the same son, he had said with reference to the study of French, which he wished his son to learn: "You must absolutely speak all modern languages as purely and correctly as the natives of the respective countries", and farther on: "As for French, you have it very well already, and must necessarily from the universal usage of that language, know it better and better every day".

Let us now open up one of the most popular authors in the On-

tario Normal Schools, Millar. This writer, who treats of School Management, and who is an authority in this matter, was the predecessor of Dr Colquhoun, the present Deputy Minister of Education. On page 73 of his book, Millar says with regard to the study of history:

"A child should realize the glorious inheritance that has been handed down from his forefathers, and should be stirred with a determination to defend the liberties of his country and to keep its honour untarnished."

This is precisely what we wish to do. Is not the beautiful French language one of the principal inheritances we have received from our forefathers? And this Deputy Minister of Education tells us to defend our liberties and to maintain the honour of our country? Yes, we will defend our liberties and this precious heritage of our language, and, by our unbending determination, we will prevent our country from dishonouring itself by not allowing it to banish the teaching of our language from the province where Millar exercised his functions of Deputy of the Minister who would practise the contrary of what he has preached.

Let us now consult Locke, the great doctor, the sublime philosopher, according to the Toronto authorities, since he is considered by them as one of the greatest lights in the matter of education. In his work upon education in his time, he says of a pupil who has already completed part of his studies (in his mother-tongue, of course): "He should now learn French".

The sentence of Lock's proves

two things: firstly, that the elementary education of a child should be carried on in his mother-tongue, and, secondly, that Locke considered the study of French as necessary to the complete education of a child. Otherwise, why say he **SHOULD** now learn French.

Landon, another author that is well known to the students of the Normal Schools in Ontario, in his "Principles and Practice of Teaching and Class Management", an excellent book, says what follows on the 6th page of the 5th edition:

"We must proceed in accordance with nature; hence our teaching and training **MUST CONFORM TO THE LAWS OF THE CHILD'S GROWTH, AND THE MODES IN WHICH THE MIND ACTS.**"

Now, how can the teacher proceed in accordance with nature and conform his teaching to the peculiar activity of the child's mind if he does not make use of the pupil's language in order to instruct him? We think in a language; the mind and the language are so closely allied that the Bonald went so far as to say that language "engendered" thought. His statement is evidently wrong for then deaf-mutes and children who cannot yet speak would be unable to think; but this error goes to show how very close indeed is the connection between one's language and his thoughts.

"Language, or speech, serves to transmit thought, and that, as it were, is its social function. It establishes a means of communication among men. Without it, man would be almost incapable of intellectual development, and would

remain almost wholly a stranger to science, to morality and to civilization." (Jaffre, *Cours de Philosophie*, 1883). Now, if speech transmits thought, it is clearly evident that to do so it must be understood by the pupil to whom this thought is to be transmitted, which is tantamount to saying that for the child who knows no other than his mother-tongue, the language of instruction in school must be that mother-tongue itself. And it is only by adopting this method that the above principle quoted from Landon can be put into practice.

Landon again, at the bottom of the same page, says: "Methods must be exactly suited to the needs of the pupils, their capacity, knowledge and stage of development". Now, how can the methods of teaching be "exactly suited to the needs, the capacity, the knowledge and the stage of development of the pupil" if the teacher teaches him in a language he does not understand? Instruction, then, in any language other than the mother-tongue is directly contrary to the sound pedagogical truths taught on this point in the *Norme Schools of Ontario*, a province that preaches and violates this principle at one and the same moment.

OPINION OF COMENIUS

I might quote other analogous principles laid down by the same author, but this article is already longer than I intended it should be, and I wish to call upon the greatest possible number of authorities to support my contention. This is why I refer to a very great name to which all modern educators bow, particularly those

connected with the Ontario Education Department. I refer to Comenius. This author, who helped to revolutionize the teaching methods in vogue in the 17th century, and who laid down many of the principles upon which modern teachers base their teaching, expressly says: till a pupil has attained his eighth or tenth year, he should receive his instruction **ONLY IN HIS MOTHER-TONGUE**.

Is this clear enough? Is it not categorical enough? Do we not find in these words the formal condemnation of the system adopted towards French Canadian pupils by the Ontario Education Department, and this by the authors that are, if not the greatest, at least some of the greatest, authorities on educational matters, and rightly considered such by the educators of our province.

These prominent authors, as can be seen, powerfully contribute to establish the false move and the bad faith of the Education Department. There is however something still stronger and more convincing than these authors; we shall place the Minister of Education in a position wherein he contradicts himself in the most flagrant manner possible.

MINISTERIAL CONTRADICTIONS

For several years past the Minister has caused to be prepared certain pamphlets on the special methodology of each of the subjects in the Course of Studies, and these are distributed free of charge to all school boards. These pamphlets are well prepared, and everybody approves the Minister's move in this matter because it is an excellent means of main-

taining teachers up in their work by keeping them in touch with the latest and best methods of teaching.

Through the kind offices of a teacher who sympathizes with us in our fight, I have been enabled to cast a glance into one of these pamphlets, that which treats of the special methodology of composition. And what do I see there? I shall quote verbatim from page 3 of this pamphlet: "The **MOTHER TONGUE** is therefore rightly regarded as the **SUPREME SUBJECT OF STUDY**, at least in elementary education".

Oh! in that case the French Canadians are right, unless the Minister believe that their mother-tongue is English! !

On page 8, I find the following: "Undoubtedly the chief literary asset of the child on entering school is his proficiency in his mother-tongue. It is important to know how he has acquired this, for the related school process **SHOULD PRESERVE AN ESSENTIAL CONTINUITY IN HIS MENTAL HABITS.**"

Now, for a young French Canadian, who has never spoken any other language than French, do we "preserve an essential continuity in his mental habits" by giving him his instruction only in a language he does not understand? To merely ask the question is to answer it and, in the same breath, to confound the Minister of Education with his own words.

But there is still better than this. On page 11 here is what I find: "It is best to require children always" to tell it in their own words". This means that, when an answer to a question is

required, it is always better that the pupil should answer by using his own language rather than to employ those of the author of the text book. If he makes up his own answer, it is certain that he has understood, on condition, of course, that it be the correct one. Well now, how can the young French Canadian use "his own words" to answer in English when he does not know that language?

From what I have quoted, one of the two following conclusions must be adopted: either the author of this pamphlet is in error, or the Minister has legislated in a manner contrary to common sense. But the principle laid down by the author is beyond attack. It therefore follows that the Minister has made a regulation distinctly contrary to the true principles of pedagogy and he has taken it upon himself to make it known to the world.

I shall now lay down a simple argument to add, if it be possible, something to what has been said by the authors already quoted. It is everywhere admitted that we cannot learn anything, or remember anything, unless we pay attention to it. Now, we do not pay attention to anything unless that thing interests us. We must therefore feel interested in a thing in order that it may captivate our attention. Now, I ask you what interest can a pupil have in a lesson taught in a language he does not understand? The answer to my question is very simple: he can have none; experience proves this superabundantly. When a Canadian born English speaking person hears a French song, let us say, in public concert, does

he listen to it? Is it not a fact that, as a rule, he leaves the audience or talks to his neighbor? He does not wish to be rude, but he does this simply because, not understanding the selection, he has no interest in it, and it does not hold his attention. Can one blame a French Canadian pupil for acting in a similar way when the teacher gives a lesson that conveys no meaning to his understanding? From this it follows that, having no interest in the lesson, he learns nothing. The necessary conclusion forces itself therefore upon us: the system adopted by the Minister to the effect of having the lessons taught in a language other than the mother-tongue will inevitably result in condemning the French Canadian children to ignorance, that is, exactly the opposite of what the Minister says he wishes to do.

M^r Elie Blanc in his Treatise on Philosophy says that language is the most perfect of signs. I agree with him, but on the condition that he add the following words: "when it is understood". For language that is not understood will not arouse any idea whatever in the mind of the hearer, words in themselves having no meaning. They express a thought inasmuch as we are acquainted with the tacit agreement whereby a certain sound or series of sounds shall be the sign of a particular concrete thing or abstract idea, or express a certain thought. If therefore I speak in English to a young French Canadian who knows nothing of the tacit agreement just mentioned, I shall cause no thought to arise in his mind, for language, contrary to de Bonald's assertion, I repeat

it, has not the power of engendering ideas.

This reasoning applies to the general course of studies, to arithmetic, to geography, to history, etc., but when it is a matter of learning English itself, which is a necessity in our country, I fully agree with the protagonists of the natural method who advocate the learning of English by speaking to the pupil in English only. During the English lesson, therefore, the pupils and teacher should speak in English only.

The pupils will thus learn to think in English when they speak in that language and avoid the difficulty inherent to the translation which all persons must perform when they speak in a language in which they are not accustomed to think. Besides, it is the general rule followed throughout the world. The Italian mother

teaches her child Italian by speaking to it in Italian. Thus also do the Spanish, the German, and all the other mothers everywhere in the world. Translation is the worst of methods for the teaching of a language, for the pupil always remains with the triple task of thinking in his own tongue, of translating this thought and giving it expression in the language in which he desires to express himself. But I insist on saying that, outside of the study of the English language itself, all the subjects of the course of studies, geography, history, etc., should be taught in the mother-tongue of the pupil.

I shall continue this study in a future number by considering the French language as the language of instruction and communication, and then of the rights of that language from the standpoint of the law.

THIRD ARTICLE

In my last letter on this subject I showed the unanimity that exists among the authors on pedagogy concerning the necessity of giving primary instruction in the MOTHER-TONGUE. The doctrines enounced by them absolutely condemn the attitude taken by the Minister of Education towards the English-French schools of this province. I have quoted their words textually, some even going to show the flagrant contradiction existing between the pedagogical principles preached by the Minister of Education and the methods put into practice by the same Minister. I have produced as witnesses against the latter the authors that are considered authorities in the Normal Schools es-

tablished by this same Minister, among others Comenius, Millar, Locke. I must here add that the advice of Locke is followed in teaching French in the High Schools when the primary course is terminated, but that, so far as the French Canadians are concerned, his other principle, that if given a primary instruction in the mother tongue, is set aside by the very same authorities.

It is not necessary to be a great philosopher in order to conclude that this is pedagogical anarchy for French is taught to the pupils of these High Schools, preponderatingly English while the teaching of this same language is refused (for one hour of teaching is practical refusal) to those who

are in great part unable to obtain an education in the language which is sought to be imposed upon them. The absurdity of this conduct strikes everyone who is not blinded by prejudice and hatred of French.

I should have included, in that part of my remarks touching French as a subject of study, a few words concerning the famous HOUR of French each day. It is not too late, however, to come back to — and I believe it is necessary that I should do so.

According to the Regulations and Course of Studies of the Public Schools, imposed upon catholic separate schools (sic) by the Minister of Education (ever careless towards these schools, so much so indeed that he never went to the trouble of making any regulations to govern them), the primary classes, called "Forms" are four in number. The pupils are supposed to pass two years in each of these Forms, so that there are at least two classes in each of these Forms, a first-year and a second-year class. This makes at least eight distinct classes.

I am told, however, that, on account of the great distances some pupils have to go to reach school, bad roads in spring and fall, etc., as a rule there are three subdivisions A, B and C in the first year of the First Form. This would add at least two more classes to those already mentioned, which means that there are generally ten distinct classes in a rural school. This kind of school, where all the classes are confided to the care of one teacher, is called an ungraded school; while a graded school is one where a teacher is charged with — class only, or at most two. — to have made one regulation only for each of these two different sets of schools

is inconceivable on the part of educationists who lay claim to anything like competency in their science. I hope my leisure time will allow of my preparing an article upon the teachers' timetable and especially upon the minimum of time that should be given to French as a subject of study.

Let us now return to the much spoken of Hour of French. French as a subject of study, as I have already said, consists of reading, spelling, literature and composition for the First Form, or for each of the first four classes of the course, which makes 16 lessons per day. French Grammar, being added to the studies of the six other classes, constitutes the fifth subject these classes should study; this would give a total, for these six classes, of 30 lessons a day. The 16 and 30 classes thus formed make a total of 46 classes. But, as certain of these subjects are taught alternately, time not allowing of their being taken up every day, the number of lessons is diminished to about 30; let us say 20, so as not to run the risk of being accused of exaggeration. Now, divide 60 minutes among 20 classes, and you have an average of 3 minutes to a class. If these classes are somewhat numerous, and where the pupils are French-Canadian, they always are, I ask the Minister what a teacher can teach in that time? Here is an example: let us say 3 minutes are given to a class of 10 pupils, that is, 180 seconds must be divided among 10 pupils. This will give only 18 seconds or three-tenths of a minute to a pupil. But this is wrong, for the explanation, if it be a reading lesson will take up the greater part of the three minutes, and the pupils, some of

them at least, will be obliged to return to their seats without having had time to read. The reading lesson proper will have to be given the next day, and the pupils will have had time to forget, owing to lack of application, a good part of the explanations given them the previous day. But I have again fallen into error, and a serious one, for the time necessary to come from their seats to the class-line will still further diminish their meagre three-minute period. The lesson will thus have to be short, very short, if an explanation of the difficult and unknown words, the epithets and allusions of the author are to be given during one lesson period. This applies to all the French lessons; they will be so short that practically nothing can be accomplished even by the most capable teacher. We thus see that the attitude of the Minister upon this point is so evidently contrary to common sense that it merits to be characterized as a PEDAGOGICAL MONSTROSITY, unless he wish to cause the French language to disappear from this province. Thank God, he will never see such a forfeiture in a race that has victoriously resisted all attempts at assimilation since 1759, and who to-day is more vigorous and more determined than ever to maintain its identity as an ethnological entity on the soil of Canada, whose flag shall protect its rights for which in return it will, as it always has in the past, receive proofs of its firmest loyalty.

I do not believe, however, that the Minister desires to banish the French language from the soil of Ontario; he publicly declared that such was not his aim; but the fatal and inevitable result of put-

ting into practice the system elaborated under the direction of Dr Meath, Superintendent of Public Instruction, his mentor, would be the gradual elimination of our language for want of persons knowing French sufficiently to be able to teach it. If he wish to prove that he has acted in good faith, for it is allowed that even a Minister of Education may err, he has nothing else to do than to withdraw his Regulation, now that he knows, or ought to know, that its carrying into execution will have for effect to drive out of this province one of the two official languages of Canada, which is, without the possibility of a doubt, contrary not only to the spirit but to the letter of the Constitution, as I shall show it to be. Let us now proceed to the second part of this article:

FRENCH AS THE LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION

All that part of this series of articles already published, treating of the French language as a subject of study from the pedagogical standpoint irrefutably establishes the absolute necessity of making use of the mother-tongue as the language of instruction. It is true that the teacher who would substitute the English language for it, might teach his French-Canadian students certain technical terms in that tongue, a certain English terminology more or less extended concerning arithmetic, geography, history, etc., but, if the words which he uses with these terms are not understood; if his expressions produce a vague idea, or none at all, in the mind of the pupil; if, on account of this cloud interposed between him and his pupil, his explanations lack clearness, and especially if they

do not cause to arise in the pupil's mind the ideas he wishes to communicate to him, his most successfully taught lessons in arithmetic, his best descriptions in geography, his finest historical expositions, will never create the interest essential to the attention which the pupil must pay in order to learn these subjects, for the simple reason that the pupil will not be interested in descriptions and explanations which he does not thoroughly grasp. These are already difficult enough in themselves without setting about to create insurmountable barriers which prevent the pupil from grasping and assimilating them or which wholly discourage him. Again, words do not engender ideas; they cause these to arise only in so far as the persons to whom they are addressed perfectly understand their bearing.

The mind of the pupil, when instruction is given in a language with which he is not familiar, is wholly occupied with trying to grasp the meaning of the teacher's words, and cannot simultaneously do this work and give his full attention to the matter itself of the lesson. The result is that, when the class is over, the pupil has spent all his time trying to fathom the meaning of the teacher's English words and sentences, but there remains little or nothing of the arithmetic, geography or history lesson. Now, I ask what progress a pupil can make under such conditions? One need not be a Doctor of Pedagogy to know it: he will make little or none depending upon his greater or lesser knowledge of the English tongue, and the continuation of such a system can spell nothing but the dooming to ignorance of all the little French-

Canadians who frequent the English-French or bilingual schools. And it must necessarily be worse where no French whatever is in use.

TEACHING SHOULD BE PLEASANT

Moreover, the tyrannical instructions 17 violate another pedagogical principle set down in Landon on page 27, 5th Edition; this principle reads thus: "Teaching must be pleasant so as to secure interest and attention; it must follow the path of the LEAST RESISTANCE". Does teaching by the very most difficult manner possible constitute the observance of this principle? Is it by teaching in a language that is not familiar to the vast majority of the pupils, and which is assuredly not understood by the young, that the teacher puts this principle into practice? I call the Minister of Education's attention to this flagrant transgression of one of the most universally recognized principles of modern education, and dare him, in view of this principle, to defend the stand he has taken. He cannot do it, and his regulation stands condemned by his silence.

Ah! if the little French-Canadians knew English before coming to school, it would be a different matter. They could then devote their time to the matter of the lessons without being retarded by the means adopted to teach them. This brings us logically to the question whether, by chance, the Minister should happen to believe that his tyrannical measure will encourage French-Canadian mothers to teach English to their children. Persecution will have no other effect than to perpetuate the French language in our fami-

lies, and on that score let us thank God for this persecution. Our language was disappearing, slowly but surely, through daily contact with the Saxon element, and through the negligence of our own people to stand erect and claim their rights. Our enemies. I say the word advisedly, remarking this fact, thought that one fell blow would suffice to crush out our language, to annihilate it. They have succeeded only in awakening our French pride and to-day, hand in hand, we have decided never to renounce our rights and to cause the French language of our fathers to fall upon the ear of the Saxon till, wooed and conquered by its beauty and sweetness, he also learns to admire it, to love it, to speak it. In the meantime, the French-Canadian woman, seeing that efforts are made to despoil her child of the beautiful language of France, will take the means to teach it to him to the exclusion of all others, and to inspire in his soul a particular and imperishable love for the only language that can perfectly reflect the ideals with which his French soul is imbued. She will engender in that child's heart an unconquerable determination never to betray that language or abandon it especially at the ever noisome, though not very dangerous, behest of the Orangemen who, in the present instance, have a spite against our language because it is here in Canada the most powerful bulwark of the Catholic religion.

A language is learned by associating certain articulated sounds with things seen, felt, tasted, touched, and with other sounds that are heard. This is true to the extent that a child born deaf

or who becomes such before having learned to speak, never learns the ordinary language of man : he cannot associate language that he has never heard with things seen, felt, tasted and touched.

Little by little, for the child who can hear, words expressing actions, the names of things, the relations between these things, etc., begin to amass themselves in his mind; they are added, one by one, to his incipient vocabulary. they broaden it, and after a lapse of time, longer or shorter depending upon his intelligence and those of his parents, as well as his surroundings, they become the means that serve to express his thoughts on all that his faculty of observation will have exerted itself.

Now, since that is the experience of the entire world, is it not reasonable to follow the same proceeding in order to teach English to the French-Canadian children? Of course, and they should learn it as A SUBJECT OF STUDY, but it never should be imposed upon them as THE LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION. School life is at most, so short that, if we were to impose upon our children this pedagogical inanity, they would pass all this precious part of their lives breaking their heads to understand the English sentences of their teachers and then would go out into the world ignorant of the other matters of the general course of study, the knowledge of which is necessary to form enlightened citizens, men and women useful to society in which they are destined to live.

It therefore follows that, for our children, English should be taught as a SUBJECT OF STUDY, and no person is opposed to

this; but the French Canadians will NEVER accept English as the language of instruction for their children. I am firmly convinced that I express the well-defined and absolute determination of all French Canadians when I say WE CANNOT SUBMIT to this humiliating regime, firstly, and I repeat it, because it would be the abandoning of our mother-tongue, secondly, because the use of English as the language of instruction is IMPOSSIBLE. It would be, moreover, condemning our children to ignorance.

I am not a teacher but, during my life, I have come into contact with a large number of these devoted servants of the public, without whom one century would suffice to throw the most highly civilized nations back into barbarism, and, as a result of my discussions with them, I have reached the conclusion that it would be well to teach the lessons, in the first place, in the mother tongue. then the technical terms in the two languages simultaneously. and accustom the pupils to use these freely in each language so that they could express themselves in one or the other without having to borrow from one when they are speaking in the other language, and vice versa. When one discusses a subject, say in French, it is most humiliating to have to confess ignorance of the technical terms necessary to express one's thoughts, and most embarrassing to be obliged to have recourse to English for these terms.

Is it not owing to this defect in our teaching methods that are born our anglicisms; e. g. binder, mower, and so many others for which the proper French terms are given in "Le Bulletin du Parler Français". To teach the les-

son in French and review it in English would be an excellent method to accustom the pupils to think in the language in which they would be called upon to express themselves, and to give them greater facility to speak in one or the other. This would be a veritable English-French, or bilingual system and it is by adopting such a system that we shall, I believe succeed in making of the bilingual system the best one in the province.

The teachers have only to will it in order to reach this result. Let us therefore teach English to our children; I am in favour of it, but we cannot allow it to supplant our mother-tongue.

I therefore conclude, firstly, that the MOTHER-TONGUE should be the language of instruction for the French-Canadian; secondly, that English should be taught as a SUBJECT OF STUDY; thirdly, that the technical terms and the manner of using them should be taught in the two languages; and fourthly, that, by putting these principles faithfully into practice, our educationists would make of the English-French, or bilingual schools the best system in the Province of Ontario.

I must defer somewhat the consideration of French, as the language of communication, and its place in this province from the standpoint of the Constitution.

THE LANGUAGE OF COMMUNICATION

One word of explanation before entering upon this subject: The word "communication" above includes all relations, commands, exhortations addressed by the teacher to the pupils during the course of the day. It is these commu-

nications that fix the atmosphere of the school; this will be French or English according to the language used in these matters by the teacher.

I now quote the text of Regulation 17 (more properly called Instructions 17), section 3, sub-section 1 bearing upon the subject:

"Where necessary in the case of French-speaking pupils, French MAY be used as the language of instruction and communication; but such use of French SHALL NOT BE CONTINUED BEYOND FORM 1, excepting that, on the APPROVAL of the CHIEF INSPECTOR, it MAY also be used as the language of instruction and communication in the case of pupils beyond Form 1 who are UNABLE TO SPEAK and UNDERSTAND the ENGLISH LANGUAGE". (The capitals are mine).

Let us analyze this jewel, this Regulation that constitutes a part of the legislation of Ontario, the "banner" province of Canada, and let us proceed clause by clause:

Where NECESSARY in the case of French-speaking pupils, French MAY be used as the language of instruction and communication.

According to that a teacher bent upon assimilation, even though the French Canadian pupil should not understand English, is not obliged to speak to the latter in French, for the word "may" leaves him free, does not force him to use the French language in order to be understood. Moreover, if the French Canadian pupil should understand English, it is not NECESSARY to employ his language, not even to teach him French and, being given the anti-

French Canadian feeling of certain teachers, not being obliged to speak French, they will never do so. In French centres these would remain the alternative of dismissing them, which is not easily done for refusal to teach in French when the Regulations do not bind them to do so, would not be a legal cause of dismissal of course, this remains always possible, but on the condition of paying the teacher's salary for the whole year. It must be remarked that these Instructions 17 do not give the trustees the POWER TO ORDER THAT THE TEACHING BE GIVEN IN FRENCH. Not having this power the trustees would tolerate the teacher rather than pay him a salary for nothing. In this way the work of anglicizing the French pupils would proceed slowly but surely. Of course, there are sufficient means whereby the teacher could be dismissed: but, what an amount of trouble would ensue!

What I have just said with reference to the discretionary power of the teacher, is corroborated by section 4, sub-section 1 of the Regulation where it is said that the instruction in French which "may be taken" only by pupils whose parents or guardians direct it. "MAY, notwithstanding 3 (1) above be given in the French language.

In order that this instruction in French may be received the parents or guardians MUST order it specifically. Encouragement given to the betrayal of our language is here easily seen and, in order not to be a traitor, in order to have one of the two official languages of Canada taught our children, we must claim this right at

the beginning of each school year; we must bow to Gesler's cap on the market place. Is there one French Canadian who, knowing this, will forget to give this order to the teachers? Is there one even among us who does not feel the gratuitous insult hurled at everything we hold dearest upon earth? These Instructions are filled with insults: insults to our forefathers, insults to our family traditions, insults to our national traditions, insults to our blood, insults to our race, insults to our fathers, insults to our mothers! And, after that, we would go to the pains of teaching English to our children? No, a thousand times no! Since our fellow-citizens wish to act in this manner, let us banish their language from our houses as we would an unclean thing, let us drive it from our assemblies, let us hurl it out of our churches. Let us speak French among ourselves, in the workshop, in our stores, in the street, everywhere. They would have us forget our language? Let us redouble our efforts to make it ring from one end to the other of the Province. In that case, it will be time to learn English when our children go to school. We will see that it be **NECESSARY** to use the French language as the medium of communication and instruction. We can be depended on to see to that.

And there are French Canadians, fortunately extremely few in number, but there are some — the writer knows two — who are low-spirited enough not to feel the affront, and who speak in English among themselves! We have some, public men even, whose names dishonour our race, and who

counsel us to relegate our language to the family circle and to speak only English in the street! Shame upon these men: they are varlets and properly trained ones at that. They look for the approval but especially the votes of the majority. The English papers made it their duty to reproduce their advice. Thank God, it was the noble words of Lafontaine: our minds reverted, and we rebuked those that counselled cowardice and treason. The men who thus advised us never felt the noble pride that should fill the breast of a man, a true one. But... let us consider the next clause:

"But such use of French shall not be continued beyond Form 1, excepting that, on the approval of the Chief Inspector, it may also be used, etc."

Now, the end of the First Form occurs two years after having entered school. And, as pupils begin their school career at the age of 5 generally, they will, according to this regulation, have terminated their study of French at the remarkably advanced age of 7. Comenius says that till the age of 10 a child should receive his instruction exclusively in the mother-tongue, and Comenius is a recognized authority even by the Ontario Education Department.

It is more than ever urgent to ask ourselves where the future teachers of our children are to come from if the French instruction our pupils receive to-day is to stop at the age of 7, for, there is no gainsaying it, the privilege accorded by these instructions 17 of teaching reading, composition and grammar, no more than one hour each day, however numerous the classes may be, will never

allow one single pupil of our bilingual schools to acquire a sufficient knowledge of French to be able to teach it efficaciously in the future. The Minister has been, to say the least, wrongly informed as to the importance of one hour's teaching, especially as regards an ungraded school.

If he really know its value, then he may boast of his generosity (!) But, I was forgetting: he reserves French for the English pupils of the High Schools who will, pitying your ignorance of "Parisian French", say that they have "liou (lu)oune livre bien intéressante" or that they have "oune brévé d'aptitoudes et de la savouarre de la parlé française". Chouinard has given a perfect pen-picture of them; read him. (1) May the translator say that all educated French Canadians speak as perfect French as do educated Parisians, that, as the English Canadians consider themselves superior in respect of language to the slang loving Cockney, so the educated French Canadian speaks better French than either the uneducated Parisian or the French type corresponding to the Cockney, and who delights in the "argot" a term that is equivalent to the English slang.

How could it be otherwise when all, or nearly all, the grammars and dictionaries used in Canada by the French are published in France? How could it be otherwise when thousands of French Canadians subscribe for and read the following newspapers from France, L'Univers, La Croix, Le Gaulois, Le Temps, and dozens of others? The few anglicisms that are used by the French Canadians have somewhat disfigured, but

have not changed either the nature or the beauty of the French language spoken by them.

The pupil is promoted to the Second Form at 7 years of age, and, unless the parent or guardian specifically orders it, he is to learn no more French; and again, despite the order, it may be taught him through the medium of English. But, however, permission is not given to teach him arithmetic, geography, etc., through the medium of French, the mother-tongue, without the permission of the Chief Inspector which must first be obtained, and this only on condition that the pupil be wholly ignorant of English.

This is going rather far, is it not? It is this officer who will decide upon the denationalization of our children. Well, we presume that this inspector is a gentleman, and French civility obliges us to treat him as such. It is, however, our duty to tell him that there can be no question of politeness where we have to defend our national rights. The exigencies of politeness disappear from the moment we are called upon to perform an act of cowardice and treachery to our mother-tongue. Politeness may not impose silence upon us and prevent us from resisting his directions from the moment he orders us to abandon our constitutional rights. The 250,000 French Canadians of this province, men, women and children refuse to submit their existence as a race to the dictatorship of this officer. We are French Canadians and no power will be allowed to change this. Even though the present Chief Inspector were conciliating, to induce us to swallow the pill, the day will come when such sen-

timents would no longer be the fashion, and it would then be too late for us to protest. We must act now and not permit this invasion of our rights. We know how much we can trust our English fellow-citizens: just long enough to permit them to acquire the brutal force of members necessary to crush us, and they never fail to manifest this characteristic national trait they have no sense of generosity, no, not even that of justice. But... let us continue with the regulations.

"On the approval of the Chief Inspector French MAY be used as the language of instruction and communication, etc." Here is what this officer will approve or disapprove. As for the French Canadian pupils who know English, they are out of the question: they MUST STUDY all of the general course of studies in English, but the Chief Inspector will decide whether or not a teacher shall use the English language to instruct a pupil who does not understand that language. What do you think of it? This officer who probably is a good pater-familias, and against whom I bear no personal grudge, who even has all my sympathy for he has no small task to perform, will decide if a French Canadian teacher, or one who knows our language if he is to teach in the English-French schools, shall, yes or no, speak French to a young French Canadian pupil who does not understand English. It seems to me that, were I in his position, I should soon reach the conclusion that a French Canadian teacher who would ask my approbation or direction upon such a subject is fit for the lunatic asylum.

With such a disposition in the law, whether you have or have not ordered that French be taught your child, the teacher cannot, without the approbation of the Chief Inspector, speak to him otherwise than in the English language outside of the three-fifths of a minute of class in the 330 minutes that constitute the school day, and this only on condition that the pupil know not, or passes for not knowing, English, for he must be ignorant of the English language before the question can even be submitted to the Chief Inspector.

What pupil who has even a little pride, who would consent to be called ignorant? For, after all, under these conditions, the idea will soon prevail that it is sufficient not to know English to be classed among the ignorant classes. Clear distinctions concerning the ignorance of this or that are not made a tender age; the pupil feels only that he passes as being ignorant — in globo, as it were. What humiliation! We could easily imagine ourselves in Russia submitting to the brutal treatment inflicted upon the Jews by the Russians, or again, under the iron heel of the German soldier. It is scarcely possible to realize that this is taking place before our very eyes in Ontario a British province. A dog that you ill-treat will lick your boots; a child brought up in such a state of mind that he thinks himself the inferior of everybody else becomes the humble and cringing servant who, without any more pride than is to be found in the dog, will clean your boots, or hold out his hand for a top (a respectable-looking way of begging), but he will never be a

man in the highest and noblest sense of that term. He is, at all ages, ripe for slavery and serfdom. In order that a child may become a man worthy of the name Canadian, he must be brought up in such a way as to develop in him the spirit of national pride and not that of social inferiority. In order that he may become a strong man and a citizen worthy of the race to which he belongs, we must develop in him this strength and this national pride and not that of weakness and servility.

Now, as a matter of fact, what will happen when the French Canadian pupil does not understand the teacher — who stubbornly persists in speaking only English to him, for, I repeat it, the teacher is not obliged to use French? I ask this question, because there are teachers who wish to conduct everything in their own way, and I repeat it, nothing in the Regulations obliges him to have recourse to the Chief Inspector: he may even desire to impose his own will in the matter. I distinctly remember a young French Canadian who declared to me that his public school teacher had threatened to beat him because he had refused to read the Protestant Bible. Why would not as much be done to another who would refuse to answer in English? I fear our children will soon have to learn the deaf and dumb language, for the young French Canadians who do not yet speak English, and to whom it is forbidden to speak in French after the First Form without the approbation of the Chief Inspector, will have no other means of making themselves understood while awaiting his decision.

As to section 4 (a) and (b) which touches upon the manner of proceeding to teach English to French-speaking children who do not know that language, no one has, I believe, any objection to sub-section (a) which lays down that the teaching of that language should be begun upon the child's first entry into school. English is a subject of study like any other, and can and should be taught by the natural method; but I am absolutely opposed to sub-section (b) which says that as soon as the pupil has acquired a sufficient facility in the use of the English tongue, he shall follow in that language the course of studies laid down for public and separate schools. It is not necessary for me to repeat the arguments already given and quote Comenius, Landon, the Minister of Education himself to condemn this sub-section of the regulation: common sense alone suffices to establish its absurdity. It is in the mother-tongue that one should take up a course of studies, especially when this language is French and one of the OFFICIAL LANGUAGES of the land.

We are being submitted to the same treatment in this matter as are the Maoris of New Zealand, the native population corresponding to our Indians, with the exception of the miserable pittance which we have to beg for each year. (See New Zealand Official Year Book, 1913, p. 216, 2nd paragraph), and not even put on an equal footing with the Boers in South Africa. And this, despite the fact that our language is one of the official languages of Canada, the international language of science and treaties, and that of

all learned society all over the world, even in England itself.

I believe I have shown clearly enough the cruel position in which we are placed by these Instructions 17. There is only one consolation in this connection, and that is the unanimity manifested by the French Canadians in their determination not to allow themselves to be crushed. With one voice all repeat the pass-word of resistance: **NON SERVIAM** and it is not one William Tell but 250,000 such who refuse to bow the head to Gester's cap.

There's for you with Instructions 17, an edict that will cause future generations to blush with shame at the thought that such a document ever existed as part of the legislation of a British province in the early 20th century. It is the act of a tyrant, and certainly not that of a wise and prudent legislator.

Here is Regulations 17 as it stands in so far as the schools actually in existence are concerned.

The bad faith of our enemies has however gone further, and this in such a way that the greater number of those most interested, even the best advised, did not notice it. As a matter of fact, if the defenders of the French-Canadian cause had fully realized that section 4 of this regulation prevented the establishment of new bilingual schools, they would certainly not have been silent on the matter of this denial of justice and they would long since have called attention to the insurmountable obstacle that the Minister of Education has tried to put in the way in order to prevent the teaching

of our language to future generations of French origin.

I quote this section 4 of the Regulation 17; here it is:

"4. In schools where French has **HI**THERTO been a subject of study, the Public or the Separate School Board, as the case may be, **MAY** provide, under the following conditions, for instruction in French Reading, Grammar and Composition in Forms I to IV [see also provision for Form V in Public School Regulation 14 (15) in addition to the subjects prescribed for the Public and Separate Schools".

This has no meaning whatever if not that in schools where French has not hitherto been a subject of study, the Board will not, in the future, have the power to change into a bilingual school one that has not up till that time been a bilingual school, even though all the pupils attending it had become French Canadians (through the disappearance of pupils of the other races), nor will they be authorized to establish new bilingual schools even though they were to be frequented by French Canadian pupils only.

It was at first thought that this section affected only certain schools actually existing but there is no doubt that a strict interpretation of the letter of the regulation allows a judge to declare that, according to this clause no new bilingual schools can be established and no hitherto existing schools can become bilingual.

If it were not clear that all this elaborate display of learned-looking though fundamentally pedagogically and constitutionally erroneous regulations, is to tumble down through the action of the courts because this regu-

lation reposes upon nothing, yes, nothing, since the resolution of 1911 never having had the form of a law, and never having received the sanction of the Lieutenant-Governor, is not a law, and since, moreover, Regulation 17 being founded upon this semblance of a law, cannot be more binding than the resolution upon which it rests, if it were not clear. I repeat, that all this elaborate display of regulations is to tumble down, there would be reason to despair of human justice, at least as it manifests itself in this Province of Ontario.

The malice contained in this word "hitherto" clearly depicts the state of mind of him or them who inserted it in this regulation, and shows how much they are unaware of the love French Canadians have for the language of their forefathers and how greatly they have been deceived as to the powers of resistance of this people who is prepared to undergo any and every sacrifice before it will abandon its language. The French race is one that cannot be assimilated; it is one of the mother races and is endowed with its own physical, intellectual and moral life independently of all other races. Its descendants shall tread the soil of Canada when, following the example of the Pilgrim Fathers, its enemies, for want of descendants, shall have disappeared from the soil of America as effectively as the Astecks of Central America have done leaving nothing but a vague souvenir of their passage among the peoples recorded in history.

In the meantime it appears certain that, according to this section 4, no new bilingual school can be established and no existing public or separate school can

become a bilingual school till the regulation has been set aside by the courts.

4.—THE RIGHTS OF THE FRENCH LANGUAGE

We have seen above that paragraph 17 of Instructions 17 which concerns the right that a teacher, even a French Canadian, has of speaking to his French Canadian pupil. It is one of the points on which this regulation infringes most seriously upon natural rights, overrides common sense, ignores the established principles of pedagogy and defies the constitution of this country as we shall presently see.

Let us dispose at once of the fallacious argument that the Minister of Education is not obliged to spend public money to help the French Canadians in learning a language other than that of the majority; this has already been advanced. It is an easy matter to answer this claim, for there is no doubt in the minds of many that from the standpoint of the schools, if not from those of the legislature and the courts of justice, as it will hereafter be shown, the French is on the same footing with the English language in this same Province of Ontario, notwithstanding certain laws that have been adopted. Moreover, the Minister of Education is not called upon to pay more for our schools more than our proportionate share, and this from our own monies, for we contribute in the same ratio with our English-speaking fellow-citizens to the funds necessary for the administration of the Province. We have therefore the same right as they to participate in the school grants.

The Ottawa school-board has even shown that an unjust legislation favours the Public Schools to the detriment of the Separate Schools by giving the former all the taxes collected from public utilities.

Let us now return to the regulation. I do not pretend to have made a discovery, for I am merely repeating what others have said before me; but, all together, we cannot proclaim it too loudly nor too often so as to put ourselves upon our guard against the doings of the Department of Education: **THE OBJECT IS TO ANGLICISE US, and in order to attain this end they wish to ATTACK AND EXERT THEIR INFLUENCE UPON OUR CHILDREN.** It is then our duty to watch over these children, the men of to-morrow, and not allow anyone to cause them to forget the language of our ancestors, the very basis of their mentality, and that will distinguish them from all the other races who with them will later inhabit this country. We must not allow our language to disappear from this Province.

What! the French language is on an equal footing with the English tongue throughout Canada, since in the federal parliament, which is the official organ of the whole country, it is as official as English in debate and in the archives of both the House of Commons and the Senate, in the pleadings before the Supreme Court of Canada and before the Exchequer Court as well as in all the other courts that are, or may be established under the jurisdiction of the B. N. A. in all the provinces of Canada, and yet a provincial government would have the power to ostracise it and to forbid two French Cana-

dians from speaking French within the limits traced for it by this same federal parliament! It is claimed that, because they are in a certain spot during certain hours of the day, and because one is a teacher and the other his pupil, two French Canadians may be forbidden to speak one of the official languages of Canada! And it is a PROVINCIAL legislature that would have the right to abolish one of the two official languages of Canada, and this without the intervention of the federal authorities! This is incredible, so much so in fact that we would be tempted to smile with pity merely at seeing the efforts put forth to accomplish this end, but these efforts are so persistent and appear so irresistible that, if we would prevent their success, if we wish to stop our language from being abolished in fact, we must absolutely once for all time, take the means of having its rights recognized in Ontario. This question must be threshed out before, and judged by, the highest tribunal in the Empire, and the energy of all French Canadians must be devoted to the cause of the defense of the minority in Ontario. Party spirit must disappear before the danger that threatens us, the members of the federal parliament must take an active part in the matter and force the federal government to see to it that the Constitution that guarantees our rights is respected, for, there is no mistaking the fact, our existence as a race is threatened and, if success were to crown the efforts of our adversaries here, who knows if a further attempt would not be made and if Quebec itself would not be the next field of combat.

NO OFFICIAL LANGUAGE IN THE SCHOOLS

When in 1867 the B. N. A. decreed that both the English and the French languages would be upon an absolutely equal footing in the federal debates and in the Courts of Justice established under the jurisdiction of that act, there was no question of the language of the schools. By this legislation, the question of official languages was restricted to parliament, provincial legislatures and the federal and provincial courts, and there can therefore be no question of official language in the schools without going beyond the constitution. The language of the school must consequently be the language of the people, that is, of the pupils that frequent them. Article 93, B. N. A. gives to the provincial legislatures the power to legislate in general upon matters of public instruction, but, in so far as separate schools are concerned, it simply states that the powers, privileges, and duties granted or imposed upon the separate schools of Upper Canada shall be extended to the schools of the English minority in Lower Canada. Now, it cannot be gainsaid that among these privileges there existed the right to teach the French language in Upper Canada. Now, it cannot be gainsaid that, which is proved by the fact that the English people of Lower Canada, perfectly understanding their rights, have always taught English in Lower Canada. This establishes the fact that both minorities had the right to teach their mother-tongues.

Moreover, in section 92, B. N. A., which defines the provincial powers, there is no question in any one of its sixteen sections of

giving to provincial legislature the power to legislate upon the matter of an official language. and, even though the members of a legislature were unanimously in favour of such a measure, this unanimity would not make this act constitutional, for, if this principle were admitted, it would suffice for the members of any legislature to agree to arrogate to themselves all sorts of powers, even those that belong exclusively to the federal and even to the imperial parliament itself. Now, although art. 93 gives provincial governments the right to make laws relating to education, this power does not include that of declaring the English language to be the sole language of the schools, and of banishing therefrom the French language. Legislation might be passed against all other languages but the English and the French, but, on account of the official position of these two in the Dominion, they cannot be touched. The provincial legislature has therefore not the power to attempt to denationalize our children by regulations, the putting into execution of which will cause them to forget their mother tongue.

Sullivan in his "Government in Canada", edition of 1887, page 107, discussing the question of provincial rights, says the following: "The provinces can claim nothing in the way of legislation except what is expressly given to them". I therefore conclude from this that the Ontario Legislature went beyond its power in two circumstances in the matter of languages; here they are :

a) — by passing Ed. VII, ch. 39, sec. 80, ss. 1 and 2, which establishes the English language as the sole language of instruc-

tion and communication in the Public Schools of this Province; and,

b)—by adopting a resolution, which is not incorporated in the Separate Schools' Act, nor in its amendments, to the effect that this sole language tolerated in the Public Schools, but shall also be the only language of the Separate Schools, of which the English-French form a part.

I repeat it, this act and this resolution are unconstitutional because in passing them the legislature has exceeded the powers conferred upon it by art. 92, B.N.A., and these two pieces of legislation are not justified by art. 93 which places public instruction under provincial control.

Abolishing one of the official languages of Canada cannot properly be said to fall within the scope of public instruction. If my contention is right, and it is the point which the Privy Council shall have to decide, Instructions 17, in so far as it limits the teaching of French as a subject of study to one hour each day, and its interdiction as a language of instruction and communication are absolutely null and void, no regulation being more constitutional than the law upon which it is based.

But an extraordinary feature of this imbroglio is that Instructions 17, appear to be founded upon the Public Schools Act which does not govern in Separate Schools. The Separate Schools Act Contains no disposition as to an official language in the schools of the Province; how then was it possible to base a regulation governing the English-French Separate Schools upon an article that DOES NOT EXIST in the

act that governs these schools? This is impossible to explain. It seems that so important a disposition as that whereby an official language in the Separate Schools is established should be found in the Separate Schools' Act, unless the Separate Schools are to be governed by the Public Schools' Act. This is what has been done with regard to the Regulations and General Course of Studies as well as the text books, and on this score the Separate Schools are practically abolisher at the present moment—all schools being practically governed by the Public Schools' Act — and this with the apparent approval of the so-called defenders of the Separate Schools.

Leaving out of consideration its constitutionality, these Instructions 17 are null and void on account of the IMPOSSIBILITY of putting them into practice. The astuteness, the trickiness the absolute disloyalty of our adversaries are worthy of remark; the law establishing English as the sole language of the public schools was passed in 1901, and it is only in 1911, ten years later, that we are called upon to feel its effects. It was probably believed that no one would raise the question of its constitutionality. Our representatives were in that circumstance taken by surprise — probably told it would never effect separate schools — by a parliamentary majority that had no innate sense of justice. This majority adopted a law contrary to natural right and which for this reason alone, does not command obedience. It is impossible to put it into execution and easily eluded. Moreover, since no one, according to the old legal

maxim, can be forced to perform an impossibility, the legislative authority cannot oblige anyone to speak a language unknown to the speaker. From this viewpoint alone the law and the Instructions 17 are null and void AB INITIO.

But there is more to be added: sec. 93 B. N. A., ss. 1 says that all the rights and PRIVILEGES accorded the separate schools and existing at the time of confederation cannot be interfered with by a provincial legislature although this same power governs in matters of public instruction.

Now, the official documents clearly establish that French was legally recognized as a language of instruction and communication at the time of Confederation. Moreover, there are persons living to-day in the Counties of Prescott and Russell and in Kent and Essex, who can testify as to its use in the schools to the knowledge of the then Minister of Education. This officer at about that time even authorized certain French text books. (See Hon. Judge Constantineau in "La Langue Française en Amérique", and the writings of Waldo Guertin in "Le Devoir" and "Le Droit").

The use of the French language at that time was at least a "privilege" enjoyed by the separate schools at the time of Confederation, and art. 93, ss. 1, B. N. A., expressly states that the legislature cannot infringe upon these privileges. So that, again on this point, the act of 1901, the resolution of 1911 and Instructions 17 are all unconstitutional and cannot command our obedience. They are a transgression upon our recognized rights.

One word more: in what position would we French Canadians

be if we lost our language as a result of the ignoble war waged upon us by the Minister of Education? The Minister was driven to this by narrow-minded orangism and encouraged by another element, the ally and accomplice of the latter, to adopt an unconstitutional law, the only object of which is to denationalize us, and with the ulterior motive of making protestants of us, or even to dechristianize us, a state of mind in which they would rather see us than to know we are catholics. It is however certain that the French mind is too logical to accept that hotch potch of religions, of divers opinions which are mis-called faith, and that rather than accept such a medley of religious contradictions, we would fall into religious indifference. This is what has occurred, unfortunately, in France where protestantism has never been able to make any headway, and it is in this state of mind that the orangemen would plunge us rather than see us refuse to accept protestantism. They are seconded in their efforts by certain catholics who without reflection, to say the least, have formed an alliance with the bitterest enemies of the Church to wage war upon us. What a horrible responsibility they have accepted ! ! !

Was the effect in keeping with their expectations? No, a thousand times, no, and the answer so far as the future is concerned, is no more reassuring, for the enemies of our race. They have met a resistance the unanimity of which is a warrant of success in the near future. Why will the government not submit this question to the Privy Council? Why? Because the government knows its law is unconstitutional. That is why the

Ottawa School Board should bring its cause to the highest tribunal in the Empire. It is there that we will have justice meted out to us, and, considering the composition of the Canadian tribunals, it is only in England that we can expect to obtain a full recognition of our rights and an order that the above-mentioned law and regulations be considered null and void.

But, I return to my question: in what position would we be if we lost our language? We would become a bastard race, having no link with the past, and having become a member of a family that is not ours. We would have broken with our history, abandoned our traditions and forgotten our national glories. It would ill befit us to speak of Clovis, of Charlemagne, of St. Louis, if we had forgotten the accents in which they used to command their people. How could we have the heart to cast a glance into the past and recall our martial heroes: Turenne, Davoust, Ney; our literary lights, Bossuet, Corneille, Boileau, Lamartine; our incomparable scientists, Pasteur, Descartes, La Placé, Foucault, if we had to draw inspiration from them through a translation of their biographies, or of history that records their great achievements?

But, would we have other heroes to replace them? How could we hesitate to answer in the negative? We can have a certain love for an adopted father or mother but never that tender sentiment which we feel for the parents that God gave us. And, even that sentiment, however sympathetic it may be, never extends beyond the

present generation. The ancestors of an adopted father never inspire any sentiment of love worth considering in the heart of an orphan. So that we could never adopt Alfred the Great, Henry VII and Elizabeth in the place of Clovis, Charlemagne and St. Louis; we could not, in the place of Corneille, Molière, Bossuet and Bourdaloue, venerate the names of Shakespeare, Jonson, Beecher or Talmage; we could not substitute in our hearts the name of Florence Nightingale for that of Ste Genevieve, nor that of Mrs Pankhurst for that of Joan of Arc.

No, never can we consent to such an oversetting of all ideals, we cannot exchange our heroes, abandon those who have so often inspired us with the salutary lessons of self-sacrifice and devotion in favour of those who, though not unknown to us, and while we recognize their merits, do not appeal to our souls, do not touch our hearts, and do not typify the ideals we have always set up as those of the great, the beautiful, the noble and the good in human nature. We cannot consent to become the adopted children if this family. We are loyal British subjects but we should not be called upon to break forever with the glorious past of the race to which we have the honour to belong, and I do not believe any fair-minded English-speaking citizen of Ontario, knowing the case as I have exposed it, will undertake to justify the conduct of the Minister of Education against the most law-abiding subjects of the greatest Empire the world has ever seen.

APPENDIX

"WE HOLD FOR SECTARIAN"

Our contemporary, "The Citizen", in its leading article of yesterday's issue, feigns to learn for the first time, through an article of "Le Droit", the close connection that exists between bilingualism and religion. The tone of the whole article is one of doubt, and the preacher who fills the editorial chair of the "Citizen" seems to hesitate in affirming what he pretends to know for fully a year past. We thoroughly appreciate the fact that the editor of so serious a journal as the "Citizen" is not, especially when he is a stranger to this country, held to know what he is talking about, and we have no grudge against the poor man for not understanding the bilingual question. We will very charitably undertake to enlighten him.

"There exists", as the "Citizen" believed, "for a year past a real union of the two questions" And this union is based upon two reasons:—

The first is that the attack directed against the bilingual schools is, to use our contemporary's expression, "sectarian", and that its ultimate object is to destroy the Catholic church. In July of last year a protestant paper of this Province proclaimed that "there would be no war against the bilingual schools if all the French Canadians were protestants", or words to that effect. Here is the prime cause of the bitter war waged against French in Ontario. And the proof is that all the forces of the

Orange fanatics of this Province are let loose against the bilingual schools. Why cannot the "Orange Sentinel" treat the question of French without casting a flood of its vituperative slime upon the Pope and "Roman domination?" Why has the Standard periodical excesses of anti-catholic bile? Why do you lie in your last article by saying that if the increase in the study of French and the corresponding decrease in the study of English have no other object than to strengthen the domination of the Catholic Church over French Canadians, then loyalty towards this country necessitates a hostile attitude towards French? Are the Orangemen alone in knowing how to be loyal British subjects? Ulster is furnishing a proof of the respect in which this organization holds British laws. Are the Orangemen alone in knowing how to devote themselves for the Motherland? Are they alone in knowing how to fight for the flag of England?

Let me remind you, Mr. Preacher, of a slight historical fact: the battle of Chateauguay, of which in the Citizen you do not dare the hundredth anniversary, because there has not yet been found an English historian impudent enough to attribute to English or Irish soldiers this victory due wholly to French valour.

When, in 1813, your countrymen crossed the frontier, it was French hearts they met at Chateauguay, and it was by French Canadian peasants, who told their beads while waiting for the

battle to commence, that your soldiers were soundly whipped and driven out of Canada. This is a page of history that you cannot have forgotten, and you impudently lie when you feign to doubt our loyalty.

The bilingual question has become "sectarian" because you have made it so. This is the first reason.

There exists a real union between the bilingual school question and the religious question because one's language is the safeguard of one's faith and because the neutral teaching which you advocate is an absurdity and has been a failure in all the countries where it has been tried.

This truth that one's language is the guardian and the protector of one's faith has almost become a maxim, and there is no necessity to multiply instances in order to prove it to be true. A trustworthy Catholic review estimates that four-fifths of the Irish who lost their language after emigrating to the United States have since then apostatized. The statistics on "Anglicization and its Work", published by "Le Droit" a couple of months ago constitute another irrefutable proof of this.

We shall not spend any more time over arguments which you would fail to understand.

Let us now pass on to a study of the system which you extol ("Citizen", 10th Sept., 1913).

A school where nothing but the natural sciences is taught and where no time is given to religion is an absurdity. Why did the Synod of the Presbyterian Church which met in Toronto on the 4th of June last, insist so much upon religious teaching in the schools? The Regina Ministerial Association also asked, on the 25th of

September last, that religious teaching should be given in the schools. May it be that your colleagues in religious belief are also in error? Let us proceed and see, Mr. Preacher, since you are an American, what have been the results of the lack of religious teaching in the United States.

The great Protestant Review, "Harper's Weekly", which so long fought against the principles of the Catholic Church concerning the necessity of the public teaching of christianity, is forced to-day to admit the truth of these principles.

"The great remedy for all our difficulties and for all the evils that beset our country as well as all other countries", said Harper's Weekly in one of its last numbers in 1911, "is the mental, spiritual and moral betterment of our people. The two agents that must concur in this betterment are education and religion. Education receives its part of attention, but, without the help of religion which must be strengthened, this education will never tide our country securely through the period of difficulties that loom on the horizon. We must ask religion especially to furnish us with men who are friends of peace, respectful of justice, and defenders of honesty". (1)

Dr. Hall, President of Clark University, of Worcester, Mass., pronounced the following words, full of meaning, during the course

(1) Note by the translator: the translation of this extract may not be the exact wording of the original, but it is absolutely the substance of the French translation which is a true rendering of it.

of a lecture given in 1892 at Philadelphia on "The Grave Errors of our Educational System":

"I believe that our friends, the Catholics, have reason to affirm that religion is an essential element in the education of youth, and there are many means of giving this education, even in our system of public instruction. (1).

Mr. Balfour, the eminent English statesman, has pronounced the following words upon the same subject; they deserve to be quoted:

"We are all convinced that the State, which is trying to bring about by its legislation, the divorce between the primary school and religion, is following the

worst policy that can be conceived in the formation of future generations. Let us therefore face the situation frankly by admitting, as it is our duty to do, the legitimate request of the parents who insist upon their children's receiving a christian education. Let us make a program of studies for the public schools that the parents can accept, and let us not fear to make religious education possible at the expense of the state". (1)

Here are, it seems to us, authorities that are as weighty as that of the Citizen. If our contemporary desires to be edified upon the benefits of his system, we shall be in a position to give him full satisfaction.



